

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM -M-481 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 17.01.2017

Rinku

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana
assisted by ASI Krishan Kumar.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition, under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought regular bail in FIR No. 118 dated 08.06.2016, registered under Section 379-B read with Section 34 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, at Police Station Israna, District Panipat.

It is contended that initially untraced report was prepared and subsequently, on the basis of secret information, the present FIR has been registered against the petitioner. Allegedly two mobile phones were recovered from the petitioner. The petitioner is not involved in any other FIR and he is in custody since 11.09.2016.

On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail

application, however, he on instructions fairly admits the fact that the petitioner is not involved in any other FIR.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

Considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 11.09.2016; the investigation stands concluded; challan has been presented; out of total 16 PWs, none has been examined so far, therefore it can be safely inferred that the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future, without adverting to the merits of the instant case, this petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail during the pendency of trial, on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

17.01.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No